

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	D. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/619,408	07/15/2003		Yoshinobu Hasuka	SIW-063	7646	
959	7590	10/18/2005	EXAMINER		INER	
LAHIVE &		FIELD, LLP.	CAMPBELL, KELLY E			
BOSTON,)9		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,				3618	3618	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/619,408	HASUKA ET AL.			
Office Action Sumi	mary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Kelly E. Campbell	3618			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROI - Extensions of time may be available under the after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date tf NO period for reply is specified above, the - Failure to reply within the set or extended pe	M THE MAILING DA the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 of this communication. maximum statutory period with the properties of the properties of the mailing the provision to the provision that the mailing the provision that the mailing the provision that t	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION	the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) Responsive to communicat	ion(s) filed on <u>29 Ju</u>	<u>ly 2005</u> .				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL .	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)	is/are withdraved. is/are rejected. b.	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected 10) The drawing(s) filed onApplicant may not request that	is/are: a) acce t any objection to the o) including the correcti	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	O-1449 OF PTO/SB/08)	6) Other:	otom reproducti (FTO-196)			

Application/Control Number: 10/619,408

Art Unit: 3618

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-2,4-7 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hasegawa et al (US 6,484,075). The applied reference has a common assignee and inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Claims 1-2,4-7 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hasegawa et al (US 6,484,075).

Hasegawa et al teaches an idle control system for a fuel cell vehicle, the fuel cell vehicle including:

a fuel cell (11) for generating electric power by supplying reaction gases, see Col

1, lines 60-67, using an air supply compressor (15) and a hydrogen supply device (21);

a driving motor (13) to which generated electric current from the fuel cell is

supplied;

vehicle auxiliary equipment to which generated electric current from the fuel cell is supplied, see Column 5, lines 10-20;

and a power storage device (12) which is charged by and stores generated electric current from the fuel cell;

an idle stop determination device which determines whether the fuel cell vehicle is in a predetermined idle mode by determining whether the speed of the fuel cell is lower than a predetermined value, see Column 2, lines 47-64 and Column 6, lines 50-64;

and the idle control system for controlling the fuel cell vehicle according to driving modes, wherein, when the fuel cell vehicle is in a normal driving mode, and not in an idle mode, the control system drives the fuel cell to generate electrical power based on electric current corresponding to a required power for driving the driving motor and the auxiliary equipment, and the power storage device (12) assists power generation of the fuel cell by supplying electrical power stored therein to the driving motor and the vehicle auxiliary equipment, see Column 4, lines 20-26 and 50-61;

when the fuel cell vehicle is in a predetermined idle mode, the control system stops the fuel cell to stop power generation of the fuel cell by stopping the air compressor; and while the fuel cell vehicle is in a predetermined idle mode, and when it is determined that the state of charge of the power storage device falls below a predetermined state of charge of the power storage device (SOC_L), the control system drives the fuel cell to generate a current corresponding to the optimum power generation efficiency of the fuel cell, see Col 2 lines 54-67:

wherein the electrical power load is a combination of power requirements for the driving motor (13), air compressor (15), and auxiliary equipment,

and wherein the power generation mode includes selecting an idle stop mode based on a determination that the electrical power stored in the power storage device exceeds a predetermined parameter, and stopping the generation of electrical current by the fuel cell, see Column 7, lines 35-40;

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa et al (US 6,484,075).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to define an "optimum power generation efficiency" and adjust the electrical current generated by the fuel cell to those parameters for optimum efficiency of the idle control system, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine—skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelly E Campbell whose telephone number is (703) 605-4264. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Ellis can be reached on (703) 305-0168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/619,408 Page 6

Art Unit: 3618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

hillicatif

CHRISTOPHER P. ELLIS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600